104-10320-10001

OGC 76-31
6-11-76

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NO-98-76
3 June 1976

Chief, Domestic Collection Division (DIRECT)
ATTN : Deputy Chief of Operations (Ed Watts) w/attach.
INFO : Office of General Counsel (John Greaney) w/attach.
Chief, Dallas Field Office
(New Orleans Resident Office)

Request for Guidance in Responding to News Media Inquiries

1. As is apparent in the attached copy of a New Orleans magazine article, former District Attorney Jim Garrison and his Kennedy assassination theories are enjoying a revival of interest by local news media. It is possible that the New Orleans R.O. may be contacted by newsmen for comments on Garrison's charges, especially in light of the recent disclosures of facts which were not made available to the Warren Commission. In the absence of more specific Headquarters guidance, we intend to respond to any such inquiries by saying that Mr. Garrison's charges of CIA involvement in the Kennedy assassination were false when he first made them in 1966, and they are still absurd today, and we prefer not to comment further. You may be able to suggest a better response than that, and if so we hope you will share your thoughts with us.

2. We are somewhat more concerned about how we should respond to any direct questions concerning the Agency's relationship with Clay Shaw, who as you know was unsuccessfully prosecuted by Garrison for conspiring to assassinate President Kennedy. Shaw, whom Garrison refers to as a CIA employee and who died about two years ago, was an active contact of Hunter Leake's during the period 1948-1956, presumably as a routine source of FPI. Despite the 30 some-odd contacts recorded on Shaw's contact card, however, his local file contains only three pieces of innocuous correspondence.

3. Since we cannot determine the nature of DCD's relationship with Shaw from our files, we would appreciate your summarizing it for us. We would also, of course, welcome your guidance in responding to any news media questions about our relations with Shaw, should they materialize.

JFK ACT
05-07-99
RELEASE

J. WALTON MOORE

Pilouck/jrs

Attach. as stated

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE IN FULL
1999

E2 IMPDET CL BY 003820

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

AP-

UNCLASSIFIED | INTERNAL USE ONLY | SUBJ: KENNEDY ASSASSINATION | SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

1	Assoc Dir Gen Counsel	7B07 HQ		
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				

Would appreciate your assistance in effecting prior guidance on this matter.

Pollard

Yes, I've called Tolbert Wells and suggested response to Pres. ref. be "the Agency has no objection to supplying all info to Select Committee subject to Committee's comment would be made in Washington. I also called Kemp to be sure I'll have to Report on JFK assassination

JMW

FORM 3-62 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS ☐ SECRET ☒ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ ☐ INTERNAL USE ONLY ☐ UNCLASSIFIED

WAS JIM GARRISON RIGHT AFTER ALL?

interview by Joe Manguno

On the soot-stained facade of an old brick building in one of the seediest parts of downtown New Orleans, scrawled in a barely legible but firm hand, stands the plaintive query: "Who killed Cock Robin?" Inside, in a modest second-floor office that he shares with a fellow attorney, is the indomitable investigator who has been claiming for nine years now to have solved that riddle—former Orleans Parish District Attorney Jim Garrison.

Jim Garrison is the man no one wanted to believe. The crusading lawyer turned shady D.A. The self-styled Poirot reduced to Clouseau. The standup comic who overstepped the bounds of good taste. Another clown in Louisiana's embarrassing political circus.

It was seven years ago that "The Jolly Green Giant," as he was sneeringly called by the media, was laughed into near obscurity with his unsuccessful trial of Clay Shaw on charges of conspiring to murder President John F. Kennedy. And two years since the once-unbeatable prosecutor had been driven from office by charges of bribery and income tax evasion, charges of which he was eventually exonerated.

In those two years, Garrison has practically vanished from the news scene, becoming more reclusive and evasive than ever, refusing interviews, as he plunged into his private law practice and the business of earning a living after more than 12 years of regular income as a salaried district attorney.

His disappearance from public view, broken last month by publication of his first novel, *Star Spangled Contract* (predictably, a fictitious account of the assassination of a president by members of the federal intelligence community), has been effected despite the fact that for two years in the late 1960s, Garrison dominated headlines and innumerable column inches of newsprint around the world with his theory that Shaw, Oswald and a battalion of others, whom he claimed were all members of the federal intelligence community, conspired with elements of the U.S. military-industrial complex to kill Kennedy.

If that didn't get enough chuckles, the motives he propounded for the assassination did: that the military and certain elements of the Central Intelligence Agency were distraught by the young president's policies toward Vietnam and Cuba. His theory had it that Oswald, Shaw and an airline pilot named David Ferrie were CIA operatives involved in the execution of Kennedy.

Oswald, himself murdered by the mysterious Dallas nightclub owner Jack Ruby, and Ferrie, who allegedly committed suicide at the height of the Garrison investigation, were unavailable for prosecution. So Garrison proceeded to trial with the lone living defendant in the assassination case, Shaw. After a bizarre two-year fight by Garrison to bring him to trial, Shaw was acquitted in March, 1969 by a jury that deliberated less than an hour. And Garrison was mocked. He conceded defeat, but a year later released his own version of the assassination investigation in the form of a book entitled *A Heritage of Stone*, in which he claimed his case against Shaw had been torpedoed by the federal government. The book was generally dismissed as a product of Garrison's obsession with the case.

Meanwhile, the strapping six-foot-five D.A. was fighting federal charges of bribery and income tax evasion in a case Garrison called "as confused as a Chinese laundry in a thunderstorm." Claiming he was as certain of acquittal as he was that "King Kong likes big bananas," Garrison beat the rap. But the damage to his reputation was irreparable and two months later he lost his bid for re-election.

Following an unsuccessful campaign for a seat on the Louisiana Supreme Court, the Jolly Green Giant retired to private law practice.

In the two years since he ostentatiously surrendered his office to Harry Connick, Garrison has watched—and can perhaps be excused the wry smile—as the Nixon administration collapsed under the weight of the Watergate scandals; as the FBI acknowledged, grudgingly, that it illegally tapped the telephones of Vietnam War dissenters and opened the mail of American citizens; as the CIA was forced to admit involvement in assassination attempts, domestic espionage and surreptitious entry into the homes and private files of prominent Americans; and illegal involvement in the domestic affairs of other nations.

Yes, it was nine years ago that this impudent small-time local prosecutor sullied the image of the United States government with lurid tales of political intrigue, murder, and cloak-and-dagger exploits of the American intelligence community. And now the chickens have come home to roost.

Yet the man who first advanced the notion that the government of the United States was involved in domestic espionage, the influencing of foreign elections and the murder of "undesirable" leaders at home and abroad has been uncharacteristically silent.

In an interview with this reporter earlier this year, Garrison broke that self-imposed silence, claiming it had been maintained first, because of the unfair treatment he had received from the media, and second, "because I don't have time."

"One reason that I don't have time for interviews explaining the involvement of the federal intelligence community in the murder of Jack Kennedy," he explains with frustration, "is that it's so obvious." His frustration turns to contempt. "It's very much as if I were to get into the habit of giving interviews to explain that the sun rises in the east. It's obvious that it rises in the east, so there's

WAS GARRISON RIGHT?

no great joy in explaining it." After a while, you get tired of trying to point it out."

It's just as obvious that Garrison adheres more strongly than ever to his theory that the Central Intelligence Agency was involved in the Kennedy assassination and that recent revelations about the CIA's involvement in foreign murder plots have only served to fan the flames of his enthusiasm about the case.

Garrison stares at the lone painting that graces the wall of his office. Somehow it seems to fit there, a stark winter scene of leafless trees in blacks and whites. No grays. Garrison doesn't see things in grays. Only blacks and whites.

"I was sure about the CIA's involvement nine years ago when I first revealed it," he reminds. "I was dancing with the CIA. I wasn't guessing. I knew the Central Intelligence Agency was involved because they were all over our office during the investigation.

"I guess a few people would say that I'm vindicated, if you want to use that word, because in 1967, I first brought out in public interview the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency in the murder of John Kennedy. That's a matter of record.

"That's also about the time heavy interest in the assassination ceased down here, because such a concept was regarded as so insane, so impossible, that the national media stayed away in droves."

Garrison's suspicions about the media run deep. It was they, the great news organs, he says, which portrayed him as a fool and a bully, and they did it all to protect themselves.

"Each element of the media has an individual interest in its own survival," he reasons, "and it will violate that interest in survival if it takes an active part in showing the involvement of the United States government in the murder of John Kennedy.

"It's black and white. They're part of the establishment—the national establishment—and too great a change threatens their survival. From their point of view, the revelation that the CIA, even on the upper-medium or upper-middle level, killed the President of the United States, might bring on some form of revolution and certainly might destroy them financially. And they can't participate in that."

Any mention of CBS television's recent series on the political assassinations and attempted assassinations of the Sixties brings a resonant chuckle from the deep recesses of Jim Garrison.

"CBS went in the tank again," he growls, "only this time they did it a little differently. They repeated their faith in the Warren Commission as they did some years back, and then added, 'However, many questions do appear and we believe there should be a congressional investigation.' That's because they know a congressional investigation is likely anyway (and because I rubbed their noses in the involvement of the United States intelligence agencies, especially the CIA, when they were down here a few months ago. So they can't get away from the fact that it has been put in their hands. They had to take a slightly different position to protect themselves; but they're interested in survival and in making money. And they would neither survive nor make money if they sought to push the CIA involvement theory too directly."

Backtracking a bit, Garrison explains that CBS sent down a researcher to discuss with him the CIA assassination theory.

"He was rather bright," says Garrison. "We talked. I tried to explain to him it was an easy ABC proposition to show the relationship of the Central Intelligence Agency to the murder of John Kennedy to the point where the burden of proof shifted to the CIA to show that it was *not* involved.

"I suggested that we go down to the *Times-Picayune* and get photocopies of the Shaw trial, because there were at least eight or nine solid witnesses who show that Clay Shaw or David Ferrie were with Lee Oswald on a number of different days in the town of Clinton, La. Clay Shaw and David Ferrie. 'Now,' I said, 'if those men turn out to be connected with the federal intelligence establishment—more specifically the CIA—then you have two men with Lee Oswald day after day who are with the CIA. Conversely, he's not with anybody during that time who's *not* with the CIA. And yet the FBI has told us he murdered the President of the United States. So the remaining part of the syllogism is to see if these men were connected with the intelligence community as I said they were.'"

CBS had taken Garrison's ramblings in stride. After all, the Shaw connection had been examined over and over again. But Garrison pointed out that new information about the former New Orleans business leader had been "unearthed." It had come from Victor Marchetti, former CIA deputy director who resigned from his job in 1969.

"According to Marchetti," says Garrison, "he learned of Clay Shaw's CIA connections during my investigation of Shaw in 1967. Marchetti says he frequently attended morning sessions with high agency officials and these officials often voiced serious concern that Shaw's CIA contacts might be uncovered and made public by me. Marchetti made these same remarks on film for the Citizens Committee of Inquiry, which has been pressing for a new investigation of the assassination of John Kennedy. Thus, in terms of probability, the assassination of John Kennedy has to appear to be connected with the intelligence community."

Shuffling through a myriad of papers in his desk drawer, Garrison produces a photostat copy of a newspaper clipping.

"Here is a description by an Italian newspaper of Clay Shaw's activities in Rome, obviously for the CIA," says Garrison. "Clay Shaw, according to Centro Mondiale Commerciale, ultimately had to leave Rome because of the political activity.

"So, we have the statements of Marchetti of the CIA that Shaw and Ferrie were CIA, and we have the statements and information by the Roman newspapers which show that Shaw was, in effect, engaged in CIA activity at a very high level in Rome in 1962. And then we have the testimony of a number of witnesses that Clay Shaw and David Ferrie—and nobody else—were with Lee Harvey Oswald day after day in Clinton. You don't have to go into all the other business of who shot John. That's enough to push the burden of proof onto the intelligence community. If our news media were objective and not so fearful, they would go on from there, not into a general investigation of who shot John Kennedy, but why the intelligence community was involved in the murder of John Kennedy, and begin at the beginning. It would save a lot of time. But the media can't afford to do that, and they won't do that."

Three months after Garrison made that statement, the Senate Intelligence Committee recommended that a new investigation into the assassination of John Kennedy focus on the role of the U.S. intelligence community in the life of Lee Harvey Oswald.

But Garrison, never one to bite his tongue about his suspicions, believes that Kennedy was not the only victim of the intelligence community's assassination plots.

"By pattern, the evidence makes every one of the major assassinations, in my judgment, suspect of being products of the American intelligence community. After the assassination of John Kennedy, the intelligence community was told by the American social and political leadership, in effect, "Kill whomever you want. We won't do anything about it." They were given the same word by the FBI, which actively participated in covering up what the top command had to know was a Central Intelligence Agency assassination. So the intelligence community knew it had a free hand and it proceeded to eliminate, at a time when it was beginning to have trouble with opponents of the Vietnam War, it began to eliminate opponents of the

Vietnam war so they could keep it going. Because it was in the interest of the intelligence community, which is part of the American warfare sector, to keep wars like that going.

"So they got rid of Martin Luther King, who had gotten the Nobel Prize and was becoming more and more vocal about the Vietnam War; they got rid of Bobby Kennedy, who had just won a big victory in California and was on the verge of becoming the next President of the United States. He would not only have gotten us out of Vietnam, judging by statements he had been making for several years, but he would obviously have initiated a serious investigation into Jack Kennedy's murder. And then, they had to shoot Wallace, too, to reelect Nixon, because Nixon, contrary to everything that poured out of Washington at the time, was about to lose the election."

Realizing such a broad statement needs some amplification in view of Nixon's landslide victory in 1972, Garrison explains: "It's a matter of one and one making two. Ten days before the Wallace shooting, the Gallup poll showed Nixon had dropped to 44 per cent and McGovern had risen to 41 per cent. That meant if the trend continued, and Nixon dropped two more per cent and McGovern rose two more per cent, McGovern was the next president of the United States. McGovern's main plank was to end the war in Vietnam. Conversely, Nixon was the warfare sector man. He was their man, so there wasn't much to hesitate about on that score."

Linking the assassinations and attempted assassination of Wallace is just a matter of common sense as far as Garrison is concerned.

"You have the same mechanics in every case," he explains. "You expose your scapegoat for all of about 15 seconds to the public, after which the public rarely sees him again. And they virtually all leave diaries which, although in their own handwritings, all say practically the same thing. So the intelligence apparatus found many different ways to get people they wanted write whatever they told them to in their own handwritings. But if you read Sirhan Sirhan's diary and Arthur Bremer's diary, after a while, you don't know which one you're reading. It's full of the false sponsor kind of thing: in other words, they leave an awful lot of material pointing in the other direction.

"And Oswald, although he didn't leave a diary, fits into the false-sponsor mold. Oswald was always with anti-Castro Cubans in New Orleans, and yet when he was arrested in Dallas, they had to bring up a big truck to take out tons of material which they had stored there, which was ostensibly his. Things like "Hurray for Revolution," and "Viva Fidel," and books which he undoubtedly never saw in his entire life, but which were stored there in piles to make it look like he was a madman, which was part of the scenario.

"Oswald," says Garrison, "was just a pretty straight lower-level intelligence employee who believed in what his superiors in the government told him. He did what they told him to do and his reward for serving the United States for 30 months in Russia was to be murdered and branded a madman. He believed in our country a little too much. He didn't realize we were not the country we pretended to be and that we had developed into a state of fascism, which he was useful to as a scapegoat."

"You have to remember that the government of the United States, with regard to intelligence, is as corrupt as a government of man is possible to be."

Back on the subject of the media's involvement in helping to cover up the assassination, Garrison shares his suspicions about freelance journalists.

"A large number of freelance writers have been picked up in recent decades by the CIA," he says. "When the CIA was formed, one of its chief objectives was to develop as much control as possible over the media. I don't think it succeeded in getting the control it wanted or else the question of its involvement in the assassination would not have been raised, although it was delayed somewhat. However, one of the most effective pieces of machinery they have is the 'freelance agent,' who writes articles which are published to prove that Jack Ruby could not possibly have been connected with intelligence in any way.

"As a matter of fact," Garrison explains, "the evidence is overwhelming that Jack Ruby was very active in 1958 until his death in obtaining ammunition and jeeps and weapons and supplies for anti-Castro forces to be shipped to Miami and used in Cuba. And there's no great mystery about the reasons for it, because that part of the Mafia which is connected with Meyer Lansky, who owned the Tropicana in Cuba, was a major ally of the CIA in its anti-Cuban activity. And that's the part of the CIA that's involved in the murder of Jack Kennedy. That's why you're seeing indications of the Mafia here and the Mafia there.

"When you're looking into it, it seems confusing at first. But when you understand that that part of the Mafia which was the ally in the late Fifties, early Sixties, of the CIA is working with the agency like it used to before, as Ruby was doing, actually the evidence is overwhelming that he was working for the intelligence community. Not as agent No. 352 with a gold badge, but as a member of the Mafia, part of which had become subservient to the CIA.

"That was Ruby's involvement from the beginning," says Garrison. "That's why he was actively engaged in the assassination. He delivered one of the riflemen to the grassy knoll, as one witness observed; although the government, the FBI, changed her testimony, I subsequently got the true testimony from her. It's up in Washington now. Apparently, that's one of the ways they persuaded Ruby it was the better part of valor for him to be the one to remove Oswald. Because a few days earlier, he had delivered a gunman to the grassy knoll. It wasn't a case of saying, 'Say, Jack, would you mind doing this little project for us?' By the time Sunday after the assassination rolled around, they were in a position to say, 'Jack, do you realize what you did the other day?' That's why he was crying the next few days. He wasn't crying about the president. He was crying because he knew what he had to do.

"The evidence is plentiful that Ruby was one of a number who worked for the CIA. And that's why the FBI never seriously investigated him. They went out of their way to avoid it. Ruby was all over the place. He was every place. Lee Harvey Oswald was at Ruby's place. He was there with one of his anti-Castro Latin associates from New Orleans. Ruby is so deeply involved in everything that it's necessary for the United States government intelligence community to hire somebody once in a while to say Ruby couldn't possibly be connected with the CIA."

Garrison's cynicism about the federal government is impossible for him to contain. It oozes from every pore. And the more he talks about the CIA connection, the more apparent his loathing becomes.

"You have to remember," he says, "that the United States government, with regard to this area, is as corrupt as a government of man is possible to be. It couldn't possibly be any more corrupt. It literally would go to into a hydrogen war with China before it would allow the people of the United States to learn the truth. That's how corrupt it is. And that shows you how far it's willing to go to keep the truth from coming out. And publishers know this, many people in news business know this, but don't have

WAS GARRISON RIGHT?

the coverage and aren't willing to bring out the truth.

"So a little comes out here and there, but there isn't enough so that it all comes out substantially and consistently. And above all, they're not being given any help by the government—a government that would rather see a million people destroyed in an atomic war with Red China or Russia than allow the people of the United States to learn the truth about what happened to Jack Kennedy. I'm satisfied that this coverup is being continued even today by key people remaining in the government who are left over from those who ratified the murder of John Kennedy."

Garrison does not shy away from the implications of such an indictment. He bluntly implies that even President Ford shares in the blame for a less-than-thorough assassination investigation.

"Ford was one of the major post-assassination conspirators," Garrison argues. "You have to understand that the Warren Commission, of which Ford was a member, was not a committee to investigate, although it was made to appear that way to the citizens. Actually, it was a committee to reach an accord. Their function was to reach an accord as to what the proper and official fiction would be. There was never, at any time, a sincere search for the truth. And one of the most active men of the Warren Commission working to fool the American people was Gerald Ford.

"I don't pretend to know all the ins and outs of the American federal machinery, but I would suspect his performance in helping to cover up the tracks of the CIA is not unrelated to the fact that he's president. That's one of his rewards. I'll put it conversely: had he been raising questions and said, 'It looks to me like the government is involved," he would not be president of the United States. In fact, he probably would not even be alive."

Laying aside his pipe and staring blankly across his desk, Garrison talks about his involvement in the assassination investigation in the two years since he left office.

"I've been so busy trying to earn a living since I ceased being district attorney, that I've found I haven't had time to do much investigating. So I guess the government knew what it was doing when it arrested me and helped me lose the election and put me in law practice, because I haven't had the time to devote to the investigation that I would like to.

"But I have learned, thanks to Victor Marchetti, that Shaw and Ferrie were both CIA employees, which means that we were not wrong with regard to the trial of Shaw. It just means that we simply did not have, as one of the jurors told someone who questioned him afterwards, enough proof of motive. He said the jurors felt there was no question of our having established a conspiracy; they just found there wasn't enough motive. But if we'd been able to show that Shaw and Ferrie were members of the intelligence community, it would have made all the difference in the world. But the government concealed information from us.

"The other significant thing that I've learned that I didn't appreciate the fullness of and so didn't make public then, was the involvement of Shaw in the Italian intelligence organization Centro Mondiale Commerciale. And the final point is that the CIA was involved, not at the topmost level, but at the upper middle level, in the murder of John Kennedy. And I'm still saying the same thing, so what more can I add, except to to say that some outside additional proof has finally begun to surface, although very slowly."

The main difference recent revelations about the CIA and FBI have made in Garrison's credibility, he says, is in the number of Americans now willing to believe his assassination theory.

"I think that's why CBS, for example, after going through its routine of 'How fast could Oswald shoot? Fast enough,' unexpectedly, on the last night, said there ought to be a congressional investigation. That's like saying, 'Everything's okay. We think everything's fine. We've looked into it and it's fine,' then calling for a congressional investigation. They're protecting themselves, hedging their bet. And they know that the last poll taken indicates somewhere around 80 per cent of the American people now question the Warren Commission's findings.

"So I think there have been things that have developed since our investigation, particularly the fact that the CIA has finally had to admit, in the year 1975, that it's been in the assassination business, just as I said it was nine years ago. They finally had to admit it was engaged in domestic activity in the United States, as I said it was nine years ago. Now, all you have to do is to get the people in Dallas—that's a very fertile area—to illuminate with a searchlight the federal intelligence community in Dallas, then you'd have an interesting situation.

"Look at the evidence. Oswald was never alone in Dallas. The man they called the lonely wanderer, the inner-ant drifter, was never alone. He was always surrounded by people in the intelligence community. If the right news instrumentality wanted to develop it, they could do a very interesting article about the intelligence social strata in Dallas in 1963 and Oswald's participation in it as social lion. In fact, I'm curious there hasn't been an article about the intelligence world of Lee Oswald. If I had time, I'd write it myself. It would be called *The Spy Who Was Left Out In The Cold.*"

Relighting his pipe and pushing back his chair, Garrison wonders aloud whether there can be any doubt in the minds of "intelligent" congressmen and senators that the federal intelligence community was involved in the assassination of John Kennedy. But he does not believe Congress will fully explore the assassination for fear of uncovering more than it could handle.

"I think Congress has shown more courage than I thought they had, but I don't believe they have that much courage," he explains. "I don't believe people in responsible positions in the government will allow the full story to come out, because there will be all sorts of rationalizations that it will not be good for the country or the people to know, etc.

"However, I do think more will be brought out now that has been. It may be that they'll sacrifice an agency or an individual—such as [J. Edgar] Hoover. There may even be an admission that others were involved, but that they failed to look extensively at the time and now it's too late to find out the truth, or some substitute fiction. I'm sure the fallback positions are being prepared to feed the American public. Based on my experiences with the federal government, I do not believe it will ever come to grips with the truth in this matter. I think it has too much of an interest in the official lie."

Garrison even adheres strictly to his original theory about the motive for Kennedy's assassination.

"I think the motives were so obvious. I just don't understand why more people can't see it and why it's taken so long for most of the press to see what Kennedy was doing. In fact, there was a concerted effort on the part of the intelligence establishment to confuse those motives and make Kennedy look like a warmonger. But there's evidence to show that the Vietnam War would never occurred if he hadn't been killed.

"He was in the process of bringing back the advisors that had been sent over there. He had ordered the first thousand back by December, 1963, but those were the first orders countermanded after his death. He'd announced in June, 1963 that we'd be out that we'd be out of Vietnam by 1965. It's a matter of historical record that has only been rebutted by general statements by freelance writers who were trying to make it look like he brought us to Vietnam.

The key to the motive factor, Garrison explains, is the Cuban Missile Crisis.

"Kennedy [illegible]

invade Cuba at the time of the missile crisis is most significant," he says. "And in order to understand how significant it is, the best way to see the response of the warfare and intelligence sector is to make a chronological listing of John Kennedy's conflicts with some elements of the executive branch which were very powerful—in some ways, a lot more powerful than he was—and put beside it the time correlation of the activities of Lee Harvey Oswald.

"And to get an even better picture of it, keep in mind that Lee Harvey Oswald is a demonstrably low-level intelligence employee of the government. That's why the FBI had an awful time with this hot potato in its hands. The CIA obviously farmed him out for a while and let him be used by the bureau while he was in Dallas. The correlation in time is significant because of the date when two men of intelligence and quasi-military character went to Dallas from Ft. Worth to see Oswald and talk to him about coming to Dallas. In other words, that was the beginning of things. Things were going into motion.

"Whether these particular individuals knew the long-range objective is secondary; things were going into motion. When were things going into motion? When was Oswald taken from Ft. Worth, where he was being trained as an expert photographer in a classified job? In October of 1962. When was the Cuban Missile Crisis? In October of 1962. You'll find these movements of bringing Oswald out of his training as an expert photographer, back into the role of the drifting loner, predated by a few weeks what had become publicly known about the Cuban Missile Crisis. That was because they were learning things quickly in Washington. So as soon as it became apparent that Kennedy was not going to give way, we see the first steps being taken toward what later became the assassination. The conditioning of the scapegoat began almost at once. What was obviously a long-range project began almost immediately, coinciding with the Cuban Missile Crisis."

What Garrison says is that it was not a policy decision of the CIA to kill John Kennedy, but that some select groups within the agency plotted and carried out the assassination and the agency was forced to cover the tracks of those involved, a thesis which runs perilously close to the plot of *Three Days of the Condor*.

"I've always emphasized it was not the agency," he says. "These were powerful elements *within* the agency. There were strong elements of the agency that were active at essentially the tactical level in doing this. But the job control shows that it went a little above the tactical level and takes you into the the domestic operations division. I think it's reasonable to assume, in view of the history of it, that there were powerful elements of the agency that sensed it, but sat back and did nothing. And after it happened, it was ratified by the entire agency because the agency did not want it known that agency elements were involved. That's why it did everything possible to help Shaw during the trial here. The murder of John Kennedy was ratified by the entire United States government and by important segments of the American community for the same reason. And that was the function of the Warren Commission: to ratify the murder of John Kennedy. It was ratified by the CIA as a policy. That was an agency policy. But the murder itself was not a policy of the agency."

"A democracy doesn't have agencies that are in the business of murder."

Garrison talks about *Three Days of the Condor* as one of a number of books which have gradually prepared the American public for an understanding of intelligence operations.

"I think *Condor* and other books like it were understandable and believable to Europeans and Englishmen well before this because that's the way it has been over there. That's the espionage game. It's the coldest of all games. I think the American public became adjusted to it somewhat, fictionally at least, by books like Le Carre's *The Spy Who Came In From The Cold*, in which the organization used him. They began to learn that fictionally and used that to adjust. And the developments of the last year or two have made it possibly for them to adjust more quickly to *Three Days of the Condor*, which is based on the concept of reality that they will not hesitate to sacrifice anybody who gets in the way, whether it's an employee or whoever.

"But the understanding that the United States government has reached the point where it engages in such literally inhuman, much less democratic, activity is just beginning to penetrate the awareness of the American people. It will penetrate last of all the awareness of the American media, because they have more to lose. The public, to rephrase it, doesn't have a great deal to lose by understanding what's made available to them. But the media has a great deal to lose by just making too much available. Then, of course, there's always the exception and there is competition and maybe in the final analysis, that may be the reason the media is finally, steadily, bringing that out. Now maybe the media will pleasantly surprise me. I don't know."

Garrison is not a man to concern himself with the ability of the American public to cope with the thought that its government may have been involved in killing a president.

"Not only can they accept it," he reasons, "but it will be the healthiest thing for the country. I think it's the only possible approach to take. The truth must be brought out before we can resume being a democracy. The truth about all these murders. The truth about the government's involvement. I started off being too idealistic and it took me years to recover from the shock that it was the government itself blocking me, to say the least."

And he has no patience with those who maintain that the American intelligence apparatus, such as it is, must be kept intact to protect the United States from others, like the Russians, who have the KGB.

"IF we are going to be a democracy," Garrison argues, his voice wavering, "then we have to be a democracy completely. And a democracy doesn't have agencies that are in the business of murder. The minute we have one agency that's in the business of murdering one man, we cease to be democracy. We resume being a democracy after we've stopped covering it up. We have to take certain strategic losses in that case, but they're losses we have to take in a calculated gamble on democracy.

"First of all, there's no reason we can't have an effective intelligence gathering machinery. We don't have to have operations, though. Most of our operations are garbage anyway and accomplish nothing. And in the final analysis, all of our operations and the terrific reputation that the CIA has given this country has hurt the country more than anything I can think of. It's caused us to be hated all over the world, particularly in South America and Southeast Asia, where they know Vietnam was essentially a CIA-initiated war. It's cost us a price in losses that we may never be able to pay. So in the final analysis, operations intelligence isn't as much a gain as it is a loss. And a true democracy should not want or have intelligence operations, because intelligence operations inevitably end in murder and inevitably result, as well, in the murder of countrymen in a democracy.

"The CIA should be concerned with nothing but correlating intelligence," says Garrison, laying aside his pipe again. "That's all it was created for. But it got into the business of murder and the business of domestic murder and the murder of John Kennedy and we're still trying to find out who we are. Because that was the ultimate corruption of the democratic system. In fact, it was so ultimate, there may not be any way to bring that type of corruption into the